

The Messenger.

SATURDAY, MARCH 6th, 1897.

OLLAPODIANA.

Trinity college has just issued Series 1, entitled "An Annual Publication of Historical Papers—Reconstruction and State Biography." It is published by the Historical Society of Trinity college, Durham, N. C., and is under the supervision of the department of history, of which Professor John S. Bassett is in charge. The sketches represent for the most part work done by the upper classes of Trinity college. It is very creditable to all concerned. The frontispiece is a finely executed portrait of the late lamented Professor Edward Graham Daves, scholar, teacher, patriot and gentleman. There is a paper by his fruitful pen on "Raleigh's New Fort in Virginia—1585"—and a well written sketch of him by Professor Bassett. There is also a sketch of Rev. Dr. F. L. Hawks, the eminent minister and author of the Colonial History of North Carolina. Both these gifted and most worthy native North Carolinians were of the Episcopal church. There are eight papers in all, with the addition of book notices by Professor Bassett. A meritorious publication that deserves to be well supported. Price \$1.00.

It will interest many of The Messenger's readers to know what books are selling best. In England, from December 21, 1896, to January 23, 1897, as reported in the New York Bookman, Mrs. Steel's "On the Face of the Waters" easily eclipsed all others. Correll's "Ziska" sold fast, 40,000 copies already ordered by the trade in advance of publication. And yet she is not really of much force in literature. Some of the other books that sold best are "The Sign of the Cross," "The Sorrows of Satan," "The Babe," "The Sowers," "Margaret Ogilvy" and "Quo Vadis." In twenty-seven chief cities in this country the sales as reported show this: "Sentimental Tommy" leading much all others. Next in order are the following: "Margaret Ogilvy," "Quo Vadis," "Seven Seas," Kipling's extraordinary poem, "Seats of the Mighty," "Hon. Peter Stirling," "Kate Carnegie," "King Noanett," and "Rodney Stone."

A new book—well praised. It is by Charles G. D. Roberts and is called "The Forge in the Forest." It belongs to the latter-day highly romantic class to which Stimson and Anthony Hawkins and several others are the chief contributors. He has also just issued a volume of poems entitled "The Book of the Native." He has also published recently "A History of Canada, one volume. Andrew Lang's "Pickle the Spy" is a noticeable book. It is not a novel but full of romantic material. It is really historic. Another work that attracts is by a Frenchman. It is "America and the Americans" and is reported to be very witty, truculent and pointed and shows up the manners, etc., of the north. Foreign writers never find out anything of the south. They travel with shut eyes and sealed ears, and returning to their country write very knowingly but very ignorantly. A "great novel" to be translated and published soon is Huysmans' "En Route." It is greatly lauded. It is noticeable that in this end of the century many "great" novels appear, but when you come to read them you are puzzled no little to find out where the "greatness" comes in. Scott and Thackeray and Dickens and George Eliot and Victor Hugo wrote great novels. Two other books that will be read by cultivated people with money are General Moltke's "Letters to His Wife" and Professor Dowden's "Life of Percy Bysshe Shelly." He was indeed one of the great poets of the last 2,000 years.

Aforetime in these columns we have ventured the opinion that it was really inconsiderate and unwise to read the very many praised novels that rush monthly from the press, and to the neglect of the really great novels that have not been read. Why give hours and days and weeks to reading books that are ephemeral—not one in a hundred will be heard of after ten years, while the classics are on the shelves unopened and great literature unread? Time is really precious. It takes, as we have before said, as long to read a second or third or fifth rate book as to read the best. We refer to this again because of a remark made by the greatest living French critic of the last two decades, Brunetiere, who is regarded generally in his own hand as filling the high place vacated by the celebrated Sainte-Beuve. He is a great lover of the foremost authors of the past. Carlyle, the great, said it was a good rule to read no book until it was two years old. This is wise. By that time it has been tested. Its living qualities are understood. A discussion of him in The New York Bookman has this:

"Although he never said it in so many words, it is clear that he would consider it no misfortune if the number of new works were considerably reduced. He is no sympathizer with the craving of so many readers for that which is new, and would consider it a great gain if more of the time spent among books were spent in serious converse with the masterpieces of the past; and this is the reason why after many battles against contemporary writers who seemed to him somewhat overrated and to a certain extent dangerous, he now prefers, in regard to a great deal that the public applauds, to preserve an attitude of disdainful silence."

There are many books of the last decade that have been belauded to a degree that now appears ridiculous. One of the foremost essayists of this coun-

try within two or three years gave an opinion of "Marcella" that will be supremely absurd to critical minds a score of years hence and even now seem unwisely laudatory to some. It is the vogue now to call a book above the common level of the whole "strong," and if really interesting and exciting "great." We have been some times allured by these terms, and reading the books have been much disappointed. We are glad that France has a Brunetiere and we wish the United States had another. In the same paper we met with another opinion of the Frenchman that impressed us. Speaking of how one kind or form of literature reappears afterwards in another distinct kind Brunetiere said that "Victor Hugo's poetry is in some respects the legitimate representative and descendant of Bossuet's oratory."

A good deal is written now of that strange literary freak, the late Walt Whitman. Books and essays and newspaper criticisms are written concerning him. Some are full of praise, others detract, and many are in the middle way. He has been an anomaly to us always. Greatly praised by many he has been repudiated by others. We never could see much of the exalted genius in him that his admirers think they see. We will have more to say another time. D. V.

RELIGIOUS EDITORIALS FOR SUNDAY.

The Presbyterians have the right system of evangelism. They elect or appoint evangelists, give a fixed salary, and keep them under the control of the presbytery. This cuts off greed and money making. Why people will give liberally to peripatetics and starve the faithful, toiling, earnest pastors is passing strange. Then some of the self-appointed evangelists are so impetuous in their money seeking. We could turn on the light upon more than one. Then some are so coarse, vulgar, profane, and even disgusting. All know how Sam Jones is given to this. So much so is he addicted to very uncommodious ways and words, so fine an ecclesiastical statesman, so excellent and able a writer, so learned and observant an editor as Rev. Dr. E. E. Hoss, of The Nashville Christian Advocate, is constrained to some plain words—"his language is plain"—in noticing Sam Jones's recent visit to Nashville, his fourth perhaps, where he preached and talked and abused for days. He concedes him a certain ability—great to attract, and usefulness, but he regards "his religious teachings as radically defective." It is seen by all who have made any thorough study of the Bible and theology. Dr. Hoss says in his clear cut words of his religious teaching:

"It does not and cannot touch the deepest springs of human nature. We must also repeat what we have said before, that many of Brother Jones's utterances are not defensible. They would be improper in any man at any time or place, and are especially amenable to criticism when spoken by a Christian minister from a pulpit. These words are not written in ill temper. We wish that we could conscientiously refrain from writing them. To even seem to oppose a man who is engaged in Christian work is most disagreeable to our feelings. Yet we stand on our honest judgment, and do not hesitate to give expression to our sober convictions."

We believe the Methodist General Conference meets next year—in May. We do not know of a "good Bishop timber" in his church outside of the episcopate, as Dr. Hoss presents. He is an unusually wise, able and well equipped divine, and sound to the core, we think, after a close reading of him for eighteen months. Sam Jones has been to Wilmington twice. In all he preached some eighteen days perhaps. We would like some one to find out the number of profoundly pious, consecrated Christians today in the city who owe the beginning of their godly, religious, useful and happy life to his preaching. Could ten be found? Could five? He probably received \$3,000 or more for the two preaching visits.

There is a work just issued that will be interesting to tens of thousands in North Carolina. It is a handsome volume issued by Revell & Co., New York. It is an autobiography and a life also of Rev. Dr. Charles F. Deems by his two gifted sons. We have not read it yet, but hope to do so, and will then write of it. We knew the able and eloquent Dr. Deems from 1847, to his death a few years ago, and after 1849, knew him very intimately. We once thought of writing to his sons giving some interesting facts we were in possession of concerning their father, but put it off until too late. What we would have written might not have been of service in the biography but it would have interested them and their aged and admirable mother, one of the "elect ladies" of God.

In the last century there were but few writers on the Christian religion who taught the great doctrine of assurance or the witness of the Spirit. We doubt if one theological writer in a hundred accepted it or enforced it. Now all schools teach it. Rev. Charles Spurgeon, an ultra Calvinist, teaches it, emphasizes it as strongly as any Arminian—the Wesleys and John Fletcher, Clarke of the last century, or Pope, Summers, Foster or any Methodist standard authority of the present half century. It is the word of God, the clear, the unmistakable doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. The following passages from the New Testament—from Paul and John—are all sufficient: "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God." Rom. 8:16. "And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." Gal. 4:6. "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater: for this is the witness of God

which he hath testified of His Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself." 1 John 5:9-15. "Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you?" 1 Cor. 3:16. "Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His." Rom. 8:9. "Ye are the temple of the living God; and God hath said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God and they shall be my people." II Cor. 6:16. A doctrine so plain, so clearly taught, so repeatedly enforced ought not to have been misunderstood, denied or avoided. When God performs the most marvellous work for and in a great sinner as to save him, he is "born again," made "a new creation" in Christ Jesus, an heir to Heaven, a joint heir with Jesus Christ. When this work, greater if possible than to create at first an intelligent, immortal soul, is absolutely accomplished, then the new life begins indeed, and God does not leave the redeemed and saved and regenerated and sanctified believer in the Crucified One to grope in darkness to sorrow in uncertainty, to be forever "crying for the light," not receiving any answer, any positive conviction, any comforting assurance to make him happy, rejoicing, contented. But God sends the power of the Holy Ghost to give him clear, positive, unmistakable evidence and assurance that he is indeed a child of God, adopted into His family, free from condemnation and wrath, a possessor indeed of the "so great salvation," verily "a son of God," saved through the mighty power of Divine grace, justified, redeemed, washed, built up and established in the most holy faith. One of the best, most spiritual, most comforting divines and authors of the Established church is Bishop Thorold. We rather think he has gone to his Heavenly inheritance. We have often followed his penetrating, up-lifting, stimulating, charming writings. He was deeply religious, a most loving and lovable disciple of the blessed Lord, and lived wisely teaching by his noble, devout example and by his gifted pen. He taught Christian assurance with iteration, earnestness and force, believing it because he had it. A man who does not possess this "pearl of great price" is not qualified to pronounce upon the precious doctrine, so true, so fundamental. The saintly bishop wrote: "Christian assurance is a humble, but firm sense of present acceptance with God in His Son Jesus Christ." He says of it that "in plain truth, it has so much to do with our happiness, and therefore with our usefulness and our holiness, that it may be well for us to try to think out, what it really means." He then discusses at length the objections to it, the true idea of it, the varieties of assurance and the testimony of Scripture. We have not space to follow him here in his lucid, Scriptural discussion. He again and again refers to this basic principle of Christian life. A minister of the Gospel who is without this assurance, is without the abiding presence of Christ and the witness of the regenerating Holy Spirit is to be indeed pitied. How can a preacher preach what he does not know, has not felt, does not possess?

THE SNAPE. The Powers will compel Greece to evacuate Crete if it is not done at once. Fitz Lee is a goldbug and his friend Grover C. has thrust conspicuousness upon him. The next congress takes charge with an empty treasury, with expenditures exceeding receipts every day. The pictures of the inauguration manufactured long in advance and distributed are now doing duty in the "great papers."

The newspapers, with the exception of mugwumps and boitocrat organs, are disposed to sting Cleveland for veiling the immigration bill. A critical Wilmingtonian says there is much bad English in McKinley's inaugural. The document was platiitudinous, common-place and conservative. That is about its size.

The latest from Cuba is interesting and encouraging. The patriots are very active. General Garcia has defeated the murderers killing many. Several other fights have occurred which show victories for the Cubans. Gomez is out of the way and even rumor fails to find him.

We heard an educated citizen ask—"Suppose Bryan had been elected in November and had been inaugurated with the country in the fix it is now in, what would have happened?" Three intelligent, university men agreed he would have been assassinated.

What will Dave Hill do with himself now? He has no office, no chance of office, is "a man without a party," and is unmarried. Where will he go? If he will go to the republicans perhaps Mark Hanna will give him something to do. He might go a-fishing with Grover.

The new senate has 42 republicans, 33 democrats, 6 populists and 8 silverites, three seats vacant. The vacant seats are Call, of Florida, Blackburn, of Kentucky, and Mitchell, of Oregon. It is not certain that the republicans will control. Hanna will do his best with boodle. He is the fellow who buys.

The blue-bird is hailed as a harbinger of Spring. It is also a reminder that a blood-purifier is needed to prepare the system for the debilitating weather to come. Listen and you will hear the birds singing: "Take Ayer's Sarsaparilla in March, April, May."

The Salvation by Christ. Petunia, Va., March 1. Editors Messenger:

Permit me to express my appreciation of the article on neglecting the salvation of Christ published in your weekly issue of February 25th. The topic is a timely one, since the Sunday schools of our land are at present engaged in the study of the Acts of the Apostles, in which book we have the record of the doings of those who first taught the way of salvation to the Jews and Gentiles. If you will grant the space, I should like to add something a little more definite to the general observations in that article, believing that the salvation of Christ is seldom set forth as clearly as it might be. A careful study of the Acts of the Apostles will show that the Holy Spirit gave to the Apostles plain and definite instructions as to what sinners should do in order to be saved, and that the Apostles were uniform in their directions to sinners seeking that way. They faithfully abstained from any declaration of the matter, until, according to the promise of the Saviour, they were endowed with power from on high. This endowment or baptism of the holy spirit came on the day of Pentecost, a short time after the ascension of Christ, when his followers were, by the gift of tongues and other miraculous endowments duly qualified for the preaching of the gospel. On that day they answered the question, "What must we do?" as follows: "Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, etc." We infer that those people believed in the Saviour, before they made the inquiry, so faith must have been the first requisite to salvation. It is stated in the continuation of the narrative in the second chapter of the Acts that those who received the word were baptized, and in submitting to baptism they must have made a confession of Christ. Thus it stands forth clear, that the steps taken there in order to the remission of sins were four, viz: Faith, repentance, confession and baptism. Through faith, the hearts of sinners were purified (see Acts 15, 9) by repentance their characters were changed (see Isaiah 55, 9) by confession, they made use of the only name by which they could be saved (see Acts 4, 12) and by baptism they changed their allegiance from the world to Christ, just as a foreigner by a definite act changes his citizenship from his former home to his new one. Changing the figure, this last was a symbol of the washing away of sins. (See Acts 22, 16).

It should be clearly understood that these four steps were necessary to the remission of past sins only. They are what might be called first principles. As to the matter of final salvation, the Apostle Paul says, (see Heb. 6.): "Leaving therefore the principles of the gospel of Christ, let us go on to perfection, etc." He upbraided some (Heb. 5, 12) because they had to be taught again first principles, instead of being teachers themselves. The Apostle Peter instructs Christians (see 2 Pet. 1) to add to faith, virtue, to virtue knowledge; to knowledge, temperance; to temperance, patience; to patience, godliness; to godliness, brotherly kindness; to brotherly kindness, love. He did not teach these things as things to be done by inquiring sinners, but by Christians who had already obeyed the first principles of the gospel of Christ. Let it might be imagined that the setting forth of faith, repentance, confession and baptism as the first principles of Christ is an unfounded assumption, let us investigate a little further. In the eighth chapter of Acts it is recorded of Phillip, the evangelist that he went to Samaria and preached Christ. It is said, (see Acts 8, 12) "But

when they believed Phillip preaching the things concerning the gospel of Christ, they were baptized, both men and women." Here the first and last only are mentioned, but as Simon, the cooper, then gave up his profession of sorcery, there must have been repentance on his part, if not on that of all, and as to confession, the inference is plain enough, when we read that Phillip preached Christ to them, and if they believed and obeyed Christ they must have confessed him.

In the same chapter it is said of the Ethiopian Eunuch, that he confessed in these words: "I believe that Jesus Christ is the son of God," and was baptized. Here faith, confession and baptism are named, but repentance is lacking. This is no doubt explained by the fact that repentance need not be emphasized in his case, as he was not guilty of the death of Christ, as the Jews on the day of Pentecost were.

As regards the conversion of Saul (see Acts 9, 22, and 25) the matter emphasized there is that he was baptized. He believed and confessed Christ when he said, Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And his subsequent writings fully attest the fact that he was repentant.

In the case of the conversion of Cornelius, after the Holy Ghost had fallen on him and his household, in order to convince the apostles that these Gentiles had equal rights with them, it is said that Peter commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord. Here faith, repentance and confession are not mentioned, but as Peter preached Christ to them, he must have declared the whole counsel of God. Certainly they were not saved by baptism alone.

Looking at these examples of conversion, can we not see a wide difference between the preaching of the apostles and that of modern evangelists? The apostles recognized first principles which saved men from the guilt of past sins, and in addition, certain requirements for those who had entered upon the Christian life. They never confused these matters. Had to say, many successful (?) modern evangelists are wresting the Word of God by setting before untaught and unconverted sinners the requirements of the Christian life, being ignorant themselves of the first principles of Christ, so mingling their teaching of that so no hearer ever comes to a definite and clear understanding. There is much excellent Christian teaching today, which, owing to the imperfect understanding of people on the subject, is only a mass of generalities. The Apostolic teaching was definite. We are living under the same dispensation as they; why not adopt their teaching verbatim et literatim and thus avoid the possibility of being wrong? Some say that the changed conditions of civilization demand different methods of preaching; but I am ready to assert that the gospel of Christ is adapted to all times and all conditions of civilization; that pentecostal results should still follow pentecostal preaching; that the simplicity of the gospel, free from all theological weights and obscurities is still capable of working wonders; and that sensationalism and questionable methods of interesting sinners, old and young, is an abomination that removes from our minds the Christ, the founder, the great central figure of Christianity.

L. T. RIGHTSSELL.

DISGRACEFUL SCENES Witnessed in Hall of House of Representatives—A Bill Repudiating a County Debt Sneaked Through the Legislature—Dr. Norment to be President of the Atlantic and North Carolina Railroad. (Special to The Messenger.) Raleigh, N. C., March 6.—Your correspondent left the house at 11 o'clock tonight, after witnessing a remarkable scene. At 11 o'clock Bryan, of Wilkes, was speaking to a ring of members, ridiculing Speaker Lusk and saying a man and not a machine was needed in the speaker's chair. Members and the galleries laughed at Bryan's flow of wit. The floor of the house looked like a battle ground, with fragments of lunches and fruit and paper. Lusk would recognize only Cook, Alexander, Hancock or Sutton, and these were tired. There was talk all over the house: "We have no speaker," "I move we elect one," "Never thought I'd live to see this tonight." Presently Bryan said: "Who is speaker?" Lusk said, "The gentleman from Wilkes." Bryan walked up to the speaker's stand and, leaning over Lusk, kept up his witty hits. He said: "You fool me, you will not give me your seat. You fooled us today when your side declared you would count the vote at 2 o'clock." Then Bryan imitated Cook's machine motions and showed in pantomime when he ran to the speaker's desk and conferred with the speaker. The galleries laughed and applauded. Anybody talked. Newspaper men took a hand in this and so did the clerks. Still the lights shown over the transoms of the doors of the governor's office. Russell was there, watching, waiting.

Senator Ray caused a sensation tonight in the senate by the exposure of a trick bill introduced by Senator Ashburn, of Surry. It is entitled "A Bill to Establish Certain Townships in Surry," and its purpose is to avoid payment of \$20,000 voted by certain townships for the railway to Mt. Airy. Ashburn practically admitted the facts developed by Ray and that the purpose was to repudiate the bonds. Ashburn was terribly embarrassed. He says he intends to put in a supplemental bill Monday to remedy the evil of this bill. Two republican senators ask me to say they think what Ashburn has done is an outrage on the legislature. Ashburn's bill is ratified and is now law.

The justices of the peace today in discharging Lieutenant Governor Reynolds from custody decided that the occupancy of a room in the capitol by an enrolling clerk was not of such a character or by such right, that trespass could have been committed by Reynolds; that they regard Swinson merely as a clerk or employe, and that he was only in the room as such.

It is stated today that Dr. R. M. Norment, of Robeson, is to be appointed by the governor as president of the Atlantic and North Carolina railway.

Cleveland's Appointments Not Acted Upon Washington, March 6.—The official list of the nominations sent to the senate by President Cleveland during the second session of the Fifty-fourth congress upon which no action was taken, was made public today by Secretary of the Senate Cox. One hundred and a half names were included in the list. Those from North Carolina are: William W. Clark, judge of the eastern district, and E. W. Wilcox postmaster at Rocky Mount and J. W. Kirby at Lenoir.

Troops Asked for at the Execution of Walling and Jackson. Frankfort, Ky., March 6.—Sheriff Plummer, of Campbell county, who is to hang Jackson and Walling, March 20th, has asked Governor Bradley for troops to surround the enclosure where the execution is to take place. The law provides that no more than fifty people can witness the hanging and the sheriff fears that a big crowd will come over from Cincinnati and tear down the enclosure in order to see it.

A REMARKABLE STATEMENT

MADE TO THE LEGISLATURE BY THE STATE TREASURER.

He Claims the Penitentiary Requires Appropriation of \$45,000—Superintendent Leazar Shows Its Inconvenience—Every Populist Member Gets an Office—Reynolds Breaks Another Tie in the Senate—Deposits Efforts to Save the Asylums—Russell Carrying His Points. Messenger Bureau, Park Hotel. Raleigh, N. C., March 6.

The statement was made last night on the floor of the house by the chairman of the finance committee that the state treasurer said the penitentiary was in debt and would need \$45,000 appropriation to carry it through. Your correspondent at once went to the retiring superintendent, Mr. Leazar, and told him of this gross error. The chairman of the committee was brought up and said plainly that the penitentiary did not cost the state a cent in 1896 and had a fine supply of provisions and forage on hand grown on its farms. Mr. Leazar said that he had not recommended a cent of appropriation for this year, or next and that if the legislature were to take its hands off the penitentiary he would give bond to carry it on ten years without a cent of cost to the state and at the same time would make money. In view of these facts, as stated by a man of such character and information the statements of the treasurer are strange.

John R. Smith, republican, took charge of the penitentiary today. He says he will make no changes in the personnel of the force until he thoroughly learns his duties and the management of the 1,250 convicts.

So far as can be learned not one of the bolting populists will fail to get some kind of an office. McCaskey, the bolter chairman, gets the place of manager of one of the state farms on the Roanoke, Reinhardt gets the state farm at Wadesboro.

The members of the house are angry with the senate for tabling the bill to stimulate local schools by the gift of \$100,000 from the public fund.

There was a desperate effort in the senate last night to save the three insane asylums from the co-operation grabbers and a colored man, a person, was a leader in this. But the vote being a tie, the lieutenant governor cast his vote to let the asylum go.

When a bill was voted on in the senate last night that no senator should take any place in the asylums of the penitentiary plan the vote was a tie. A senator the lieutenant governor voted, so as to carry the measure. He said that to do otherwise would be a reflection on the senate, which contained some of the best men in the state. The populists voted solidly to grab the asylums and against the bill to prohibit any senator from taking a position as above stated.

The republican members of the house caucused last night on Doctor's bill to amend the constitution by embodying the election laws some of its articles. The caucus in a rather informal way agreed to support it.

Persons from other states who say yesterday's scene in the capitol and riot in the house say then never, even in South Carolina in the reconstruction Governor Russell remains in his office, saw anything like it.

The general belief here is that the legislature will not adjourn sine die until Wednesday next. There was talk yesterday just after the riot that many members might leave today, to break a quorum. Today was the last of the sixty days (including Sundays) for which members get pay.

A Proclamation by the President Washington, March 6.—President McKinley's first official proclamation was issued this afternoon with the attestation of the new secretary of state, John Sherman. It reads as follows: "By the President of the United States of America: Whereas, public interests require that the congress of the United States should be convened in extra session at 12 o'clock on the 15th day of March, 1897, to receive such communications as may be made by the executive; and Now, therefore, I William McKinley, president of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim and declare that an extraordinary occasion requires the congress of the United States to convene in extra session at the capitol in the City of Washington on the 15th day of March, 1897, at 12 o'clock, noon, of which all persons who shall at that time be entitled to act as members thereof, are hereby required to take notice. Given under my hand and the seal of the United States at Washington the 6th day of March, in the year of our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred and Ninety-seven, and of the independence of the United States the One Hundred and Twenty-first. WILLIAM MCKINLEY. By the President, JOHN SHERMAN, Secretary of State.

The limiting clause restricting the action of the extra session "to such communication as may be made by the executive," suggests that possibly the president may limit the objects of the extra session to the passage of the unacted upon appropriation bills and the enactment of a tariff law, the object of which, in the words of Mr. McKinley's inaugural address, will be to "stop deficiencies by the restoration of that protective legislation which has always been the firmest prop of the treasury."

President Cleveland, when he called an extra session for the repeal of the Sherman silver purchasing law, practically limited the session to that one object.

How McKinley's Inaugural Address Strikes the Senators London, March 6.—A dispatch from Madrid to The Central News says that President McKinley's inaugural address has not caused much of an impression in Spain. The ministerial newspapers in their comments mistrust the reserve of the new president, and public opinion is very suspicious in view of McKinley's antecedents and the attitude which Secretary Sherman recently manifested in the United States senate.